

# **STAFF REPORT & WORKPLAN**

**For the  
2007 Triennial Review  
Of the**

***Water Quality Control Plan for the North Coast Region  
(Basin Plan)***

**September 14, 2007**



State Water Resources Control Board  
North Coast Region  
5550 Skylane Blvd., Suite A  
Santa Rosa, CA 95403  
707-576-2220  
[www.waterboards.ca.gov/northcoast](http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/northcoast)



## **Table of Contents**

<b>I) INTRODUCTION.....</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>II) TRIENNIAL REVIEW PROCESS.....</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>III) FUNDING AND RESOURCES.....</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>IV) RESULTS AND CONCLUSIONS.....</b>	<b>15</b>

## I. INTRODUCTION

The *Water Quality Control Plan for the North Coast Region* (Basin Plan) designates beneficial uses for water bodies in the North Coast Region, and establishes water quality objectives and implementation plans to protect those beneficial uses. The terms “water quality objectives” and “beneficial uses” are referred to in federal law as “water quality standards”.

Both State and Federal laws mandate the periodic review and update of Basin Plans, including water quality standards. State law requires that State policy for water quality control and water quality control plans (basin plans) be reviewed periodically [California Water Code (CWC) § 13143, § 13240]. Federal law [Clean Water Act (CWA) § 303(c) (1)] requires that a state’s water quality standards<sup>1</sup> be reviewed every three years, i.e., triennially. Thus, the periodic review of the Basin Plan is commonly referred to as the “Triennial Review”.

Following solicitation of public and agency comments, North Coast Regional Water Quality Control Board (Regional Water Board) staff reviewed the issues submitted by the various parties to evaluate the appropriateness of a basin plan amendment to address the identified need. Duplicate issues and similar issues were combined and consolidated as appropriate. Issues that would be most effectively addressed through means other than a Basin Plan amendment were removed from the proposed priority list. In total, thirty-nine (39) issues were identified as in need of evaluation. Staff has included twenty-nine (29) of these issues on the *2007 Triennial Review Priority List and Workplan* (Priority List and Workplan). Rationale for omission of specific issues is contained in the *Initial Staff Report for the 2007 Triennial Review*, Appendix 3 (June 18, 2007) as well as in Table 1 of this Staff Report and Workplan.

It is estimated that existing basin planning program resources are available over the next three years to complete amendments and/or investigate the first fifteen issues on the Priority List. The three-year projection for basin planning resources is approximately \$131,281.00. Several projects are scheduled to be addressed, in part, with assistance from non basin planning programs (e.g. core regulatory, TMDL development) within the Regional Water Board system, as well as the use of resources from external (outside of the Regional Water Board system) stakeholders.

Status of the 2007 Triennial Review of the Basin Plan is documented in this report. Section I, *Introduction*, summarizes the purpose of the Triennial Review and the process the Regional Water Board and staff followed in soliciting public comments on the need to review and revise the Basin Plan. Section II, *Triennial Review Process*, describes the process Regional Water Board staff used to

---

<sup>1</sup> The term “water quality standard” in the federal CWA § 303(c) refers both to designated beneficial uses and numeric and/or narrative criteria to protect those uses. Additionally, the U. S. Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA) considers an antidegradation policy to be part of a water quality standard.

evaluate and rank each relative issue resulting in the compilation of the Priority List and Workplan. Section III, the *Funding and Resources* section, includes analyses of the personnel years (PY) associated with each issue and projects the dollar resources needed to investigate the issues and develop future basin plan amendments during the triennial review period. Section IV, *Results and Conclusions*, summarizes the information contained in the Staff Report and Workplan and includes a recommendation to the Regional Water Board.

For additional background information on the legally mandated triennial review process, a description of previous planning activities undertaken by the Regional Water Board, and summaries of the basin planning issues being considered during this Triennial Review, see the *Initial Staff Report for the 2007 Triennial Review of the Water Quality Control Plan for the North Coast Region*, dated June 18, 2007. A copy of this report is available on the Regional Water Board web site at <http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/northcoast/programs/basinplan/bptr.html>.

The Triennial Review is not a Basin Plan amendment in and of itself, but suggests and prioritizes actions to be taken to ensure the Basin Plan remains an effective regulatory tool. The Priority List and Workplan adopted by the Regional Water Board as part of the Triennial Review will direct the planning efforts of staff for the next three years. As staffing and budget allow, Regional Water Board staff will consider each of the water quality issues identified on the Priority List for development of potential Basin Plan amendments. Subsequently, and separate from the Triennial Review process, the Regional Water Board will consider each proposed Basin Plan amendment using public hearings and the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) functional equivalent process. This will allow the Regional Water Board to consider each potential basin plan amendment on its own merits and to receive public input on specific issues.

The inclusion of an issue on the prioritized Triennial Review list of issues does not necessarily mean that any amendment will be made to the Basin Plan. The decision on whether or not to proceed with a Basin Plan amendment is only made after the Regional Water Board reviews the technical and legal considerations associated with an issue and determines that development of a Basin Plan amendment is appropriate for further consideration.

The 2007 Triennial Review was initiated by the release of the June 18, 2007 Initial Staff Report. The Regional Water Board held a public workshop on July 25, 2007, in Yreka. An audio recording of the workshop can be found on the Regional Water Board website at:  
<http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/northcoast/pubnot/board/2007.html>

To formally complete the 2007 Triennial Review, the Regional Water Board must adopt a resolution approving the Triennial Review of the Basin Plan and adopting a prioritized list of Basin Plan issues. Draft Resolution No. R1-2007-0076 includes findings regarding the requirements for and the intent of the Triennial Review and relevant actions taken (public workshop, ranking criteria defined, and

issues evaluated). Attached to the Draft Resolution is the Priority List and Workplan for issues to be investigated from October 2007 to October 2010. The Priority List is also included as Table 3 of this report.

The Regional Water Board is scheduled to consider the proposed Priority List, as part of Draft Resolution No. R1-2007-0076, during a public hearing on October 25, 2007. A Notice of Public Hearing was mailed to interested parties and to regionwide newspapers on August 28, 2007. The purpose of the hearing is to receive any additional public comments or testimony on the Triennial Review. Following the close of the hearing, Regional Water Board staff will provide oral responses to any additional comments received during the hearing. The Priority List and Workplan may be revised, as appropriate, to reflect additional public comments and Regional Water Board direction.

### **Revisions to the Proposed 2007 Triennial Review Issues List**

The Initial Staff Report released on June 18, 2007, included descriptions of thirty-seven issues for consideration during the Triennial Review. Two additional issues were identified following the release of the Initial Staff Report. Identification and description of the two issues is provided below.

#### Evaluate Objective for Turbidity

The current turbidity objective has remained unchanged since 1975. Since that time, uncertainty over the definition of natural occurring background levels has been expressed. The current turbidity objective may also be limiting when background turbidity levels are low (e.g., less than 10 NTUs), and a 20% increase over background levels would likely not result in impacts to beneficial uses or foul water clarity. Turbidity objectives in several other regions address this second issue by specifying the allowable increase of turbidity by a set number of NTUs when ambient background turbidity levels are less than certain amount (e.g., no increase of more than 5 NTUs when the ambient background turbidity levels are less than 10 NTUs). Additionally, the State of Oregon is currently revising their turbidity standard.

For this issue, Regional Water Board staff recommends reviewing the turbidity objectives in other Regions' Basin Plans and the State of Oregon's revised/proposed turbidity standard as resources permit.

#### Adopt Exemption Criteria for Restoration Projects

The Regional Water Board encourages restoration projects that are intended to reduce or mitigate existing sources of sediment, water pollution, or impaired beneficial uses. It is recognized that such mitigation projects may, for a short-time, release sediment in exceedance of various Basin Plan objectives resulting in potential violations of existing prohibitions. Such restoration projects should be eligible to apply for an exemption from prohibitions and water quality standards if the Regional Water Board determines that specific criteria have been and/or will be met.

Following additional staff investigation, ten issues identified in the June 18, 2007 *Initial Staff Report* have been removed from consideration during the upcoming planning cycle. Table 1, below, identifies each issue and explains the reason why the issue was dropped from consideration under this ongoing planning process.

**Table 1 – Issues Removed from Consideration on the 2007 Priority List**

<b>Issue</b>	<b>Reason for Removal</b>
<i>Review</i> <b>Policy on Waivers for Specific Types of Discharge</b>	Remove as this will be addressed outside of the basin planning process.
<i>Explore</i> <b>Activity-Based Action Plans</b>	Address issues as separate Basin Plan amendments
<i>Review</i> <b>Seasonal Discharge Prohibitions in Section 4</b>	Addressed with Low Threat Discharge Amendment.
<i>Develop</i> <b>Language to comply with Ca. Toxics Rule</b>	Address with Editorial Amendment
<i>Develop</i> <b>Water Quality Objectives for Blue Green Algae</b>	Address with TMDLs per USEPA.
<i>Add</i> <b>Salmon River TMDL to the Basin Plan</b>	Address with Editorial Amendment.
<i>Republish</i> <b>Basin Plan with Updated Electronic Format and Calwater Boundaries</b>	Address with Editorial Amendment if funds are available from State Board.
<i>Complete</i> <b>Cold Water Salmonid Habitat</b>	Addressed with Salmonid Habitat Desired Conditions Report
<i>Review</i> <b>Basin Plan for Consistency with State Plans and Policies</b>	Address with Editorial Amendment.
<i>Address</i> <b>Russian and Eel River Priorities</b>	Address issues individually.

## **II. THE TRIENNIAL REVIEW RANKING PROCESS**

### **Proposed Priority List**

The proposed 2007 Priority List (Table 3) represents Regional Water Boards staff's best estimate of the planning work (expressed in PYs) that will be needed over the next three years. The Priority List also includes issues that were identified as in need of investigation but are not expected to receive internal or external resources for development before the end of this planning cycle (October 2010). The proposed Priority List was developed based on the top ranked priority issues and available staffing, as described in Sections III and IV.

The issues will generally be addressed in sequential order based on Priority List rankings. Multiple issues may be grouped for consideration into a single Basin Plan amendment if appropriate. If the Regional Water Board determines it will not proceed with a Basin Plan amendment, the remaining resources for that issue will be redirected to begin work on the next highest ranked issue.

### **Assignment of Priority Ranking**

Regional Water Board staff used thirteen ranking criteria to prioritize each basin planning issue under consideration for the 2007 Triennial Review process. A wide range of factors were considered in developing the ranking criteria, including public comments, comments from other agencies, comments from Regional Water Board members, Regional Water Board staff comments, and the best professional judgment of Regional Water Board planning staff and management. First and foremost, any proposed changes to the Basin Plan must be consistent with the Regional Water Board's mission of protecting beneficial uses of water. Other guiding principles for prioritizing the Basin Plan workplan over the next three years are fairly straightforward, and form the basis of the ranking criteria.

In order to prioritize basin planning issues, a score of 0 to 5 was assigned to each of the thirteen ranking criteria; see Table 2, Template for a Technical Ranking Sheet, below. A technical ranking score was then generated for each issue based on the relative ranking. The ranking criteria are described in detail below Table 2.

**Table 2- Template for a Technical Ranking Sheet**

<b>Issue:</b>		<b>Score</b>
Regional Board Mission		
Resources Invested- Internal		
Resources Invested- External		
External Resources Available		
User-friendly Basin Plan		
Regionwide Issue		
Addresses Beneficial Uses or Water Quality Objectives		
Implements SB Plans and Policies (including Strategic Plan)		
Perceived Public Interest Level		
Low Controversy		
Low Technical Complexity		
USEPA Basin Plan Comments		
Regional and State Water Board Comments		
	<b>TOTAL</b>	
	<b>SCORE</b>	

Scoring:            1- Low                    3- Med                    5- High

### Criterion 1 Regional Water Board Mission (Protect Beneficial Uses)

Each issue was assigned a score in relation to the Board's mission. Issues that would address the Board's mission to protect water quality were given a score from 1 to 5 dependent on the level of protection or improvement the issue would provide.

### Criterion 2 Internal Resources Already Invested

This criterion recognizes that projects partially completed using Basin Plan staff resources should receive higher priority. It is unlikely that the Regional Water Board would recommend stopping work on issues for which this agency has invested significant staff resources. Based on the review of staff work plans over the past few years, specific issues were assigned a higher score in cases where substantial staff resources have already been expended on the issue. Projects already underway for a year or more received a score of 5. Projects that have not been worked on received a score of 0. Projects that have received some staff resources, but are not beyond developmental stages were assigned scores of 2 to 4, depending on how much work has been completed.



### Criterion 3 External Resources Already Invested

This criterion acknowledges issues where substantial resources from external organizations or other regional water boards have been invested in a project. Again, it is unlikely that the Regional Water Board would recommend stopping work on issues for which other organizations have invested significant resources. Projects that have had substantial positive comments received, technical memoranda, or monitoring studies contributed by external organizations received a score of 5, and projects that have received negligible external investment received a score of 0.

### Criterion 4 External Resources Likely Available

This criterion addresses the issue that controversial or complex issues should not receive overall a lower priority in cases where external resources (including funding from other programs within the office) are likely to be available to augment basin planning staff resources. Some issues would address compliance issues for regulated entities, with the potential to concurrently meet the Regional Water Board's mission of protecting beneficial uses. Additionally, some issues that may exceed internal resources should be considered on the Priority List when there is interest by the regulated community to devote resources to the issue. Projects with customer service value, particularly in the NPDES permit category, were given higher scores for this ranking criterion. Projects were given lower scores in cases where Regional Water Board staff could not identify obvious external funding for a project. These scores were based on experience with projects where external resources have already been invested, as described above.

### Criterion 5 User-Friendly Basin Plan

Customer service is important to the Regional Water Board as expressed in our mission statement. As such, changes to the Basin Plan must be considered in the context of the ability of the various stakeholders and interest groups in using the Basin Plan. Basin Plan users include the public, other agencies, and the implementing divisions of the Regional Water Board (e.g., the Watershed Protection Division, Cleanup Division, etc.). There may be instances where chronic compliance issues are an artifact of the system of current regulation rather than substantive issues of environmental protection. The Regional Water Board is interested in rectifying such instances. Simple non-regulatory clarifications can go a long way toward making the Basin Plan more user-friendly. For instance cross-referencing related regulatory requirements in State law or policy, and updating maps and program descriptions can provide users with current up to date information in one location. Based on input received in comment letters and at the public workshop, some issues appear to have garnered more public interest than others. The last major update to the Basin Plan was in 1993. Therefore there are numerous portions of the Basin plan that should be revised to clarify the Region Water Board's evolving core-regulatory,

cleanups, timber, and grant programs and to ensure the Basin Plan language is consistent with existing State Board policies and plans and State laws.

#### Criterion 6 Geographic Scope (regionwide or site-specific)

The Regional Water Board is interested in targeting its extremely limited planning resources to issues that will benefit the greatest possible area of its regional jurisdiction. Therefore, issues that address multiple waterbodies and regulated entities throughout the region received higher scores for this ranking criterion than issues that were more site specific or discharger specific.

#### Criterion 7 Address Beneficial Uses and/or Water Quality Objectives

Issues that improve protection of beneficial uses directly or indirectly (e.g. adoption of water quality objectives) were given higher scores. Issues that would result in little or no direct improvement of beneficial uses were given lower scores.

#### Criterion 8 Implement State Board Policies

In all triennial reviews, one of the first items under consideration is whether changes in statewide policies or plans have resulted in inconsistencies with specific Basin Plan language. Higher scores for this criterion were given to issues that would bring the Basin Plan into conformance with statewide plans or policies, especially those that have been adopted by the State Regional Water Board since 1993. These include the State Water Board's Non Point Source Implementation Policy and Strategic Plan.

#### Criterion 9 Perceived Public Interest

In this and previous triennial reviews, Regional Water Board staff have received input not only from the regulated community segment of the public, but also the public-at-large. Higher scores were assigned to issues that are perceived by staff to have higher public interest based on a combination of input from the regulated community and the public-at-large. Staff not only considered input from the 2007 review but also previous Triennial Review processes (2001 and 2004).

#### Criterion 10 Low Controversy

This ranking criterion, as well as the one discussed below (Low Technical Complexity), recognizes that Basin Plan issues with lower controversy and lower technical complexity have a higher likelihood in making it through the Basin Planning process in an efficient manner. Issues were assigned higher scores if perceived to be non-controversial.

### Criterion 11 Low Technical Complexity

This ranking criterion (as with the Low Controversy criterion), recognize that Basin Plan issues with a lower technical complexity have a higher likelihood in successfully making it through the Basin Planning process in a timely manner. Issues were assigned higher scores for this ranking criterion if perceived to be straightforward from a technical perspective.

### Criterion 12 USEPA Comments

Because the USEPA has approval authority for many Basin Plan amendments, ranking criteria should include consistency with their policies and directives. Issues that address comments in the USEPA Basin Plan approval letter, the comment letters on previous Basin Plan amendments, correspondence related to this Triennial Review, or the top national priorities as outlined in USEPA's document entitled *Strategy for Water Quality Standards and Criteria*, were given a higher score. Issues that did not relate to USEPA stated interests received a score of 0 for this criterion.

### Criterion 13 Input from State and Regional Water Board Staff

The implementing divisions of the Regional Water Board identified Basin Plan issues that they identified as in urgent need of revision to facilitate the issuance of required permits, to provide customer service, and to provide greater clarity in the most efficient manner. This criterion was the most heavily weighted, since the purpose of Basin Planning is to guide implementation of the Regional Water Board's programs. State Water Board staff also provided input on several top priority issues.

### **Summary of Comments Received To Date**

Generally, public input into the Triennial Review process has encouraged the Regional Water Board to continue working on planning initiatives already underway, citing the need for efficiency in light of scarce staff resources and investments already made by external parties. Staff is reviewing comments received on the Triennial Review, during the public workshop and comments submitted in writing. A detailed summary of the comments, including staff's responses, will be released under separate copy, on September 28, 2007 and will be available on the Regional Water Board website link listed earlier in this report.

### **III. FUNDING AND RESOURCES**

A requirement of the Triennial Review process is to estimate the personnel year (PY) resources required to investigate, develop and adopt Basin Plan amendments for each prioritized issue. Once calculated, the estimates are used to determine the number of issues from the prioritized list that can reasonably be investigated with existing resources over the three-year planning period (October 2007 – October 2010). These issues, as well as their resource estimates, are compiled in the Priority List.

#### **Current and Future Funding Estimates**

The Regional Water Board is allocated approximately \$131,281.00 each fiscal year to evaluate and complete Basin Plan amendments (non-TMDL Basin Planning). This dollar amount approximates 1.7 Personnel Years (PYs). The term “personnel years” refers to the actual or estimated portion of a position expended for the performance of work. For example, a full-time position, which was filled by an employee for one year, would result in an expenditure of 1.0 PY. Available planning resources equal 5.1 PY for the next three years.

Basin Plan projects require a minimum of 0.3 PY to complete due to the substantial amendment process. Staffing for basin planning has been augmented by other sections or divisions in order to address outstanding issues that affect a particular program or part of the agency.

#### **Resource Estimates to Evaluate Issues and Complete Basin Plan Amendments**

The resource estimate for investigation and adoption of basin plan amendments for all issues has been prioritized during the 2007 Triennial Review. Based on the Regional Water Board’s 1.7 PY per fiscal year funding allocation, the Regional Water Board will have a total of \$393,843.00 to evaluate and complete Basin Plan amendments over the next three years. Accordingly, with assistance from other programs and a small amount of external funding, it appears that Regional Water Board staff will be able to initiate work on the top fifteen issues on the Priority List and Workplan over the next three years.

In order to determine reasonable resource estimates for the highest priority issues, two main elements were evaluated: 1) the complexity of each issue and 2) the steps necessary to successfully complete a basin plan amendment.

A highly complex issue often requires the expenditure of more resources than a simpler, more straight forward issue. Basin Plan amendments of low complexity are assumed to require 0.3 PY. Medium complexity amendments are assumed to be between 0.6 to 1.2 PY, depending on whether substantial investigation

work has already occurred on a project, including dedication of resources external to the Regional Water Board. High complexity projects are assumed to require from 1.5 to 3.0 PY, depending on staff judgment of the controversy that could be anticipated.

The steps necessary to successfully complete a Basin Plan amendment are lengthy. The steps are broken into three parts, investigation, Basin Plan amendment development, and Basin Plan amendment adoption. After a proposed Basin Plan amendment is investigated, additional time is necessary to draft the amendment language and go through the formal basin plan amendment process, including preparation of documents for review and adoption by the Regional Water Board, followed by the State Water Resources Control Board and approval by the Office of Administrative Law and USEPA. The Priority List and Workplan provides estimates in the majority of cases and only indicates the level of effort necessary to take the amendment through adoption by the Regional Water Board. In a few cases, resources are only assigned through the investigation phase as indicated by footnotes to the Priority List.

The complexity of an issue was based on several factors including the amount of supporting data or information submitted or known to exist on the issue, the level of research required to understand the issue and formulate the appropriate Basin Plan amendment, the level of divergent public interest surrounding the issue, and professional judgment. Conversely, an issue of low complexity would require far less research, perhaps have less public controversy and involvement, and take less staff resources to go through the formal basin plan amendment adoption and approval process.

### **Issues That Lack Funding**

Basin Plan issues that fell below the available PY funding line are not eliminated from further consideration. For instance, in the event that projects take less staff time than estimated, additional planning work will be undertaken during the next three year period. Affected parties may provide resources to help addresses specific planning issues in partnership with the Regional Water Board, recognizing that some Regional Water Board staff time will still be necessary to accomplish formal basin plan amendment work. Each year Regional Water Board staff, in coordination with the State Water Board, develops an annual workplan for non -TMDL planning activities. The Priority List is used in formulating this workplan.

It is the professional judgment of the basin planning staff that all the issues identified on the Priority List represent issues that warrant Regional Water Board staff's attention and investigation. It should be noted that issues receiving a ranking lower than the existing resources permit, does not indicate that staff believe that the issue should not be addressed. Development of the Priority List and Workplan highlights the continuing lack of adequate resources available to fully accomplish the numerous planning activities identified as in needed of evaluation and potential action.

### Triennial Review Priority List

A total of fifteen high priorities (including seven projects already underway) were established, as indicated on Table 3 below. Seven medium priorities and seven low priorities were also identified.

**Table 3- 2007 Triennial Review Prioritized List of Issues for Investigation**

Rank	Score	Issue Description	Estimated Basin Planning Staff Resources [Bracketed resources are provided by programs other than Basin Planning]			
			FY 07- 08	FY 08- 09	FY 09-10	Total PYs
1	40	Adopt TMDL Implementation Strategies (add TMDL Action Plans for the Klamath, Elk, & Freshwater)	[3.0]	[3.0]	[3.0]	[9.0]
2	36	Complete Regionwide Excess Sediment Amendment	0.5	-	-	0.5
3	33	Complete Stream and Wetland System Policy	0.2 [1.0]	0.1 [0.8]	-	2.1
4	32	Complete Low Threat Discharge Amendment	0.4 [0.35]	0.05	-	0.8
5	32	Complete Editorial Amendment	0.3	0.1	-	0.4
6	32	Adopt Narrative Objective for Groundwater - Surface Water Policy (including update of groundwater objectives and implementation language)	-	0.3	0.3	0.6
7	31	Revise DO Objectives	[0.2]	[0.4]		0.6
8	31	Adopt Freshwater Bacteria Objectives		0.2	0.45	0.65
9	30	Update Policy on the Regulation of Fish Hatcheries, Fish Rearing Facilities, and Aquaculture Operations	[0.5]	0.2 [1.0]	0.25 [0.5]	2.45
10	30	Adopt Instream Flow Objective	[0.2]	[0.1]		0.3
11	27	Adopt Exemption Criteria for Restoration Projects	-	0.25	0.1	0.35
12	27	Adopt Policy for Mixing Zones	-	0.4	0.1	0.5
13	25	Reevaluate Temperature Objectives to Ensure Protection of Aquatic Life*	-	0.1	0.1	0.2
14	25	Update Beneficial Uses Chapter (Table 2.1)*	-	-	0.25	0.25
15	25	Consider Ammonia Objectives*	-	-	0.1	0.1

Rank	Score	Issue Description	FY 07- 08	FY 08- 09	FY 09-10	Total PYs
16	25	<b>Consider Update of Nutrient Objectives*</b>				
17	23	<b>Adopt Road Management Policy</b>				
18	21	<b>Designate Wild and Scenic River Segments as Outstanding National Resource Waters (ONRWs)</b>				
19	21	<b>Adopt Chlorine Objectives</b>				
20	21	<b>Adopt Biocriteria Objectives</b>				
21	20	<b>Evaluate Objective for Turbidity*</b>				
22	17	<b>Revise Onsite Wastewater Policy</b>				
23	17	<b>Revise Fluoride Water Quality Objectives</b>				
24	17	<b>Adopt Mercury Implementation Policy</b>				
25	17	<b>Consider Endocrine Disruptors and Objectives</b>				
26	16	<b>Revision to Herbicide Application Policy</b>				
27	14	<b>Address Composting Operations</b>				
28	14	<b>Consider Seasonal Beneficial Uses and Objectives</b>				
29	10	<b>Update Garcia River TMDL Action Plan</b>				
		<b>SUBTOTAL: Resources needed to address Triennial Review issues</b>	6.65	7.0	5.15	18.8
		<b>Resources used for conducting Triennial Review *</b>	0.3	-	0.05	0.35
		<b>Funding supported by TMDL Resources</b>	3.4	3.5	3.0	9.9
		<b>Funding supported by Core-Regulatory Resources</b>	0.35	-	-	0.35
		<b>Funding supported by External Resources</b>	1.5	1.8	0.5	3.8
		<b><u>Total Triennial Review Resources Needed (1.7 available)</u></b> (Subtotal resources for Triennial Review, less resources provided by other funding).	1.7	1.7	1.7	5.1

Issues 1 – 15 = High Priority  
 Issues 16- 22 = Medium Priority  
 Issues 23 – 29 = Low Priority

\* research & investigation phase only  
 \* funds for conducting Triennial Review added to Subtotal  
 gray shading indicates available PY funding over 3 fiscal years

#### IV. RESULTS AND CONCLUSIONS

A total of thirty-nine (39) Basin Plan issues were reviewed during the 2007 Basin Plan Triennial Review. Twenty-nine of the issues were determined to be appropriate for a Basin Plan amendment or additional investigation and were prioritized. Planning resources are available over the next three years (October 2007 – October 2010) to investigate the top fifteen issues on the Priority List. The three-year basin planning resource projection to begin work on the first fifteen issues is approximately \$393,843.00. Additional resources will be necessary as indicated by PY columns on the proposed Priority List.

The *2007 Triennial Review Priority List* will be considered by the Regional Water Board at a Public Hearing on October 25, 2007. The resource projection for the majority of issues includes the resources needed to prepare and adopt a Basin Plan amendment at the Regional Water Board level, and in a few cases, only to investigate the issue as indicated in the Prioritized List.

Staff recommends that the Regional Water Board adopt Resolution No. R1-2007 - 0076 following the 2007 Triennial Review Public Hearing.